DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 476 EA 006 322

AUTHOR Hellweg, Adele Helene
TITLE A Study of the Role Perceptions of Principals in Innovative Elementary Schools Compared to the Role Perceptions of Principals in More Traditional Elementary Schools.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 84p.; Master's Thesis, University of Minnesota

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Decision Making; *Educational Innovation; Educational Research; *Elementary Schools; Innovation; *Principals; *Role Perception; School Organization; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Participation; *Traditional Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Innovative Schools

ABSTRACT

A study conducted in the winter of 1973 attempted to investigate how elementary school principals in innovative schools perceive their roles compared to the role perceptions of principals in more traditional school settings. Thirty-two schools were designated as innovative by a panel of four elementary school principals. It was assumed that the responses of a random sample of an equal number of principals of more traditional schools were representative of all elementary school principals in more traditional schools. A 6-page questionnaire was mailed to respondents that consisted of items designed to provide descriptive data about the principal, the school, and items concerned with experiences or activities of the principals in various task areas, such as instruction and curriculum development, school organization and structure, school plant and transportation management, and finance and business management. The general conclusion is that principals in innovative schools view their roles in supervision and administration as a cooperative effort with teachers to improve the teaching/learning situation more than do principals in more traditional schools. The conclusions made on the basis of the data collected in this study are, in part, that innovative schools are more likely to be in the larger school districts; all principals communicate with parents and the community by utilizing various media; and that principals of innovative schools have been in their buildings from three to ten years and have greater freedom to modify plant facilities than do principals in more traditional schools. (Author/JF)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 094476

A STUDY OF THE ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS IN INNOVATIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS COMPARED TO THE ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS IN MORE TRADITIONAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Adele H. Hellweg

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

A Colloquium Paper

Submitted to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

University of Minnesota

Copyright 1973

Adele Helene Hellweg

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

1973

EA 006 322

CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES..... v

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM..... 1

Importance of the Study..... 1

Statement of the Problem..... 3

Definitions..... 3

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE..... 5

Changing Role of the Elementary Principal..... 5

Characteristics of a Successful Administrator..... 8

Principals' Perceptions of the Problems They Face..... 9

Summary..... 10

Conclusion..... 11

III. THE STUDY..... 12

Restatement of the Problem..... 12

The Sample..... 12

The Method..... 13

Construction and Description of the Questionnaire..... 13
The Cover Letter..... 17
Distribution of the Questionnaire..... 17

Limitations of the Study..... 18

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. THE RESULTS..... 20

Personal Data of the Respondents and Their Schools..... 21

Instruction and Curriculum Development..... 27

Pupil Personnel..... 34

Staff Personnel..... 38

Community School Leadership..... 41

Organization and Structure..... 43

School Plant and School Transportation..... 46

School Finance and Business Management..... 48

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 52

Summary..... 52

The Problem and Its Importance..... 52
Related Literature..... 52
Procedure of the Study-Sampling and Questionnaire..... 53
Discussion of the Data..... 54
Significant Observations of This Study and Their Implications..... 54

Conclusions..... 65

Recommendations..... 67

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 69

APPENDIX

A. The Questionnaire..... 72

B. The Cover Letter..... 78

C. The Follow-up Postcard..... 79

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Length of Time as a Principal.....	22
2.	Length of Time as Principal in Present Building.....	22
3.	Enrollment in Present School.....	23
4.	Number of Elementary Schools in District.....	23
5.	Support Personnel Available in Schools.....	24
6.	Vertical Organizational Pattern of Schools.....	25
7.	Horizontal Organizational Pattern of Schools.....	26
8.	The Accomplishment of the Formulation of Curriculum Objectives.....	27
9.	The Accomplishment of the Determination of Curriculum Content.....	28
10.	Implementation of Curriculum--Scheduling and Physical Facilities.....	29
11.	Implementation of Curriculum with Respect to Needs of Students such as Ability Grouping, Special Placements.....	29
12.	Selection of Materials, Resources and Equipment for the Instructional Program.....	30
13.	Planned Program for the Supervision of Instruction.....	31
14.	Responsibility for Supervision of Instruction.....	31
15.	Planned Program for the Evaluation of Teachers.....	32
16.	Responsibility for Evaluation of Teachers.....	32
17.	Availability of In-Service Education.....	33
18.	Source of In-Service Education.....	34
19.	Responsibility for Collecting and Interpreting Data on Student Enrollment and Attendance.....	35
20.	Counseling or Referral Service.....	35
21.	Responsibility for Assessing Effectiveness of Referral Service.....	36
22.	Assessment and Interpretation of Pupil Growth.....	37

TABLE		PAGE
23.	Pupil Discipline.....	38
24.	Principal Involvement in the Recruitment of Staff Personnel.....	39
25.	Selection of Staff Personnel.....	39
26.	Maintenance of Staff Personnel Records by the Principal.....	40
27.	Instructional Assignments Made on the Basis of Individual Interests and Strengths.....	41
28.	Meetings Between Principal and the Community Other than Parents.....	41
29.	Means of Communication Between the Principal and the Community.....	42
30.	Freedom to Change Organizational Pattern.....	43
31.	Organizational Changes Within the Past Five Years.....	44
32.	Source of Organizational Changes.....	44
33.	Areas Where Changes Have Occurred.....	45
34.	Selection of Maintenance and Custodial Personnel By the Principal.....	46
35.	Evaluation of Maintenance Program By the Principal.....	47
36.	Maintenance of a Safety Program Such as Safety Patrols.....	47
37.	Principals' Ability to Modify Plant Facilities.....	48
38.	Preparation of the Budget.....	49
39.	Budget Approval.....	50
40.	Budget Administration.....	50
41.	Accounting for School Monies on a Regular Basis to the Central Office By the Principal.....	51
42.	Accounting for School Monies on a Regular Basis to the Staff By the School Principal.....	51

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Importance of the Study

While the last fifty years have witnessed a vast change in the concept of supervision in education, the many innovations occurring even in the last decade have been so rapid and varied that the role of the supervisor has of necessity been affected.

A review of the literature suggests that educational supervision may be defined as a creative and dynamic role of organizational leadership for the purpose of improving the teaching-learning situation.

Through the years, while the major purpose of supervision has not changed, the means to realizing the purposes have changed. Inspection and control techniques are no longer widely accepted; nor are direct classroom observations which focus on teacher shortcomings. Within the last twenty years, there has been a major shift in the placement of responsibility for supervision. Many educators now agree that it is the cooperative responsibility of the principal and the staff to improve the teaching-learning situation.

The trend toward cooperative responsibility in educational supervision has been the result of many factors. Some of the influences are deeply rooted in the extensive growth of knowledge about subject areas as well as about the learning process. The specialization of school personnel is a reflection of this growth. Speech therapists, social workers, reading consultants and psychologists are increasingly

common in our schools. The training and qualifications of teachers have changed. The normal school teacher is adding credits toward a degree or is being replaced, and the Master of Arts teacher is no longer a rare phenomenon.

Along with their more advanced training, teachers have become increasingly professional. The result is that they are taking an active part in their own improvement and are requesting more autonomy in making decisions within the school environment. The learning situation has also changed in the direction of more autonomy for the student. Ungraded schools, team teaching, multiage grouping, programmed instruction are but a few of the vehicles which have been introduced in an attempt to facilitate this self-direction for both teachers and students.

Public interest has kept pace with the changes in education. Federal grants, Sputnik, increased enrollments at universities, taxes, bond issues, phonics approach to reading, sight approach to reading, teacher strikes, all involve the public in the educational system. The need to account to the general population appears to be a necessary challenge. The elementary school principal and his role are very much affected by these developments.

However, one of the measures of the success of a principal can be determined by his effect on the children in his school — their academic, social and psychological needs.

The direction of the innovations in elementary schools has been

viewed by some as an attempt to meet these needs of children.

Statement of the Problem

The topic which this paper attempts to investigate is how elementary school principals in innovative schools perceive their roles compared to the role perceptions of principals in more traditional school settings.

How well a particular organizational pattern of an elementary school, with all the variations of curriculum and staff accompanying this pattern, meets the academic, social and psychological needs of the children is an area worthy of investigation, but is not the purpose of this study. Neither is it the intent of this paper to present a detailed description of various organizational structures of elementary schools with their respective advantages and disadvantages (Faber and Shearron, 1970).

Definitions

An innovative school is defined as one which has changed its organizational pattern, horizontal and/or vertical, in an attempt to meet some of the changes in education mentioned such as advanced training of teachers, increasing public interest in education and the extensive growth in subject areas and about the learning process. For example, the vertical structure could be non-graded or multi-age grouping; the horizontal organization might include such forms

as team teaching or a dual progress plan.

A traditional school is one where the vertical structure is a graded one and where the horizontal organization is basically the modified self-contained classroom. The term "modified" is used since it is no longer uncommon to utilize special personnel in areas such as music and physical education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature in this chapter consists of examining articles relating to the changes in the role of the elementary school principal, characteristics of a successful principal and the elementary school principals' perceptions of the problems they face.

Changing Role of the Elementary School Principal

One author states that since 1950, elementary school principals have attained a higher degree of professionalization. (Eaves, 1969). Their responsibilities have increased; the nature of the school staff has changed and thus new responsibilities have been created for the principal. The direct instructional leadership role of elementary school principals is changing to include more emphasis on coordination and management. Effective coordination of the many activities of the elementary school requires more knowledge — about children, about instruction, about organization, about instructional materials, about society.

Administrators can also anticipate increased involvement of teaching personnel in decision making (Barbee, 1972). This is a critical step in upgrading the competence and improving the status of an entire school staff. The administrator will need to provide

additional leadership in new areas. These areas include selecting, training, utilizing and evaluating auxiliary personnel such as teacher aides and paraprofessionals. The administrator's role in evaluation of the school staff is shifting from prime evaluator to one where evaluation responsibilities are shared with others. A one-to-one teacher-administrator interaction dealing with such items as curriculum planning and materials is being reduced and the administrator's communication in these matters with groups and group leaders is being increased. It is possible that more program modification will be developed and implemented by group members and that a greater responsibility for curriculum planning, scheduling, selecting materials, and budgeting will be assumed by groups. There is thus a new dimension in leadership being initiated to include coordinating the work of instructional groups, coping with problems of group conflict, developing schoolwide policies and providing a stimulating professional climate.

Still another aspect on the role of the elementary school principal is one which relates to accountability (Lessinger, 1971). In terms of financial resources allocated, the American School system is the most expensive in the world. In terms of management, the system is comparatively underdeveloped. Accountability seeks to answer the relationship between input (teachers, books, dollars used) and output (student accomplishment or learning). Lessinger believes that society has provided only general guidelines for teachers and administrators to follow in order to achieve the

maximum in student accomplishment or learning. Thus the principal must work with his staff to construct behavioral objectives which will translate general goals and purposes into clear result-oriented directions. These directions, when implemented, will in turn enhance student learning.

One study worthy of mention is the 1968 Department of Elementary School Principals (DESP) survey of the elementary school principalship. This is the fourth survey in a series which is conducted every ten years beginning in 1928. All of the data reflect the growth of responsibilities and the improvement of the preparation of elementary school principals. A few examples of specific findings are noteworthy:

(1) The typical preparation for principals increased from less than an A.B. degree in 1928 to an M.A. and higher in 1968.

(2) There has been an increase in the availability of speech specialists, psychologists, reading specialists, specialists in science and librarians in elementary schools.

(3) Principals are moving into a "shared role" with regard to supervision - shared with resource personnel and school system committees.

(4) In the area of curriculum development and the selection of teachers to be assigned to schools, principals are participating more actively and are having more influence.

(5) There is an increased role for the faculty as a whole in developing guidelines for pupil placement and an increased

sharing with the individual teacher of decisions with regard to the use of specific methods of instruction.

(6) A decline has occurred in the proportion of time given to clerical tasks by the elementary school principal between 1928 and 1968.

Characteristics of a Successful Administrator

Findings by Thomas (1971) support the use of laboratory training as one means of effecting change in the interpersonal relations of elementary school principals with their teaching staffs. These relationships appear to have important, positive consequences for the quality of the educational program of an elementary school.

Some data about graduate students (Hamilton, 1971) studying to be educational administrators show that the students did not possess self-actualizing values that were significantly different from those of a random mix of graduate students with many occupational goals. Hamilton defines a self-actualizing individual as one who has satisfied his basic physiological, safety, belongingness and esteem needs and therefore functions better. However, the graduate students in educational administration seemed to have a greater understanding of the complex nature of man. This greater insight into man's nature supports Thomas' findings (1971) in that it suggests that good interpersonal relationships between the principal and the staff are deemed important.

Earlier studies also emphasize the importance of these inter-personal relationships. For example, Rogers (1969) found that a successful administrator is one who has developed rapport with his faculty and students. One study of upward mobility of administrators in education (Powers, 1966) concluded that those who were successful in advancing in their positions attributed their success more to getting along with coworkers and subordinates than to getting along with superiors. Those whose desire for advancement had been thwarted, manifested the strongest tendency toward rigid conformity to rules.

Bridges study (1965) revealed some indications that elementary school principals behaved more and more alike as they gained experience. There was no evaluative judgement made on these data.

Principals' Perceptions of the Problems They Face

In a comprehensive study to determine the elementary school principals' perceptions of the problems they face in administering their schools, Becker examined the contemporary conditions that have led to frustration and anxiety on the part of the building administrator (Becker et.al., 1971). The most critical problem, the ambiguity of role as manager or instructional leader, was pin-pointed as an ever-present and growing professional issue with them. The study suggested that the situation is compounded by excluding the principals from the district decision making process while at the same time increasing their scope of responsibilities

with less real authority. Three major causes contributing to problems principals face were identified: inadequate pre-service and in-service programs, inferior state certification standards, and a lack of resources to which a principal can turn for professional assistance in time of need.

The study underscored the idea that the relationship between administrative performance and organizational output is somewhat indirect since these outcomes depend upon the efforts of many other people. Thus as Erickson (1967, p. 420) stated:

> Instead of, 'What type of administrator is best?' the question 'When a given type of administrator is placed in a given situation, on what diminsions is he likely to demonstrate what strengths and weaknesses, as judged by a given set of raters or data analysis?' is a more realistic approach in analyzing the role of the elementary principal.

Summary

The following is a summary of some of the ideas expressed in the literature relating to the elementary school administrator:

1. The elementary school principal has become more professional with the increase of his responsibilities, the creation of new responsibilities and his improved preparation.

2. The leadership role of the elementary school principal is moving toward more emphasis on coordination and management of groups of teachers working in such areas as curriculum planning, selecting materials and budgeting rather than on working with individual teachers in these areas.

3. Increased involvement of teaching personnel in decision making with regard to supervision of instruction is anticipated.

4. Effective interpersonal relations between elementary school principals and teaching staffs appear to have

important, positive consequences for the quality of the educational program of an elementary school.

5. The ambiguity of the role of the elementary school principal as a manager or instructional leader is a professional issue with principals.

6. Elementary school principals are being held accountable for student accomplishment or learning.

Conclusion

The literature on the role of the elementary school principal abounds in articles on the administrative and organizational patterns of today's schools, new challenges in a new era of administration and analyses of general school functions with which administrators must deal. However, there is little conclusive research which establishes causal relationships between competencies exercised by the principal and resultant examples of effective leadership. Erickson (1967) summarizes this aspect of the research in education:

> It would appear that research on the school administrator represents an immature field, lacking well established cannons of inquiry of any notable rigor and suffering still from efforts that reflect little awareness of previous developments.

CHAPTER III

THE STUDY

Restatement of the Problem

The topic which this paper attempts to investigate is how elementary school principals in innovative schools perceive their roles compared to the role perceptions of principals in more traditional settings.

The Sample

The 1971-72 directory of the Suburban Division of the Minnesota Elementary School Principals' Association (MESPA) was the source of the sample of principals to whom the questionnaires were mailed. The directory is an alphabetical compilation of names and addresses of MESPA members who are, for the most part, elementary school principals in the Minneapolis-St.Paul suburban area. Names of those who were not principals, e.g. college professors, were deleted for the purposes of this study.

To identify the innovative schools, a panel of four elementary school principals was utilized. These administrators, located in opposite sections of the metropolitan area, were each given a directory and asked to identify the innovative schools. The criterion for an innovative school was that an organizational change had occurred in the vertical and/or horizontal structure of the school to implement an innovative program or that, at the initial construction of the

school, the facilities had been designed to accomodate such a program. The principals worked independently. The "Educational Resource Directory" NESPA 1972 was an additional source. Thirty-two schools were designated as innovative.

To obtain an equal number of traditional schools, the sample was selected randomly from the remainder of the listed membership. Every seventh name was chosen. A total of sixty-four questionnaires was mailed at the end of January, 1973. Each included a cover letter. The questionnaires for the innovative schools were blue and those for the traditional schools were white. They were coded to facilitate follow-up. Appendix A contains a copy of the questionnaire and Appendix B a copy of the cover letter.

After ten days, a postcard (Appendix C) was sent out as a reminder to those who had not responded. Responses were received from 61 or 95.3 per cent of the sample.

Upon examining the school description data on the first page of the questionnaire, it was decided that one school which had been designated as innovative, would be classified as traditional. Two which had been included in the sample of traditional schools became part of the innovative group for the same reason.

The Method

Construction and Description of the Questionnaire

The data for this survey was obtained by the use of a questionnaire which was mailed out to respondents. It consisted of two types of items. The first type related to some descriptive data about the

principal and the school; the second type attemped to elicit responses concerning the experiences or activities of the principals in various task areas.

The first step in the construction of the questionnaire was to examine the position of the elementary school principal in terms of the competencies needed in the aforementioned task areas. Specific traits or qualities of the person were not examined. It was decided that a more useful approach was to concentrate on what good principals do (the kinds of skills they exhibit in carrying out their jobs effectively) rather than on what good principals are (innate traits and characteristics). In this study, the approach utilized in the construction of the items was to try to compare what principals do in innovative and traditional schools— the skills which they exercise in fulfilling their responsibilities.

A skill implies an ability that can be developed and is manifested in performance, not merely in potential. Three kinds of skills in school administration were examined – technical, human and conceptual.

Technical skill implies an understanding of and a proficiency in a specific kind of activity. Developing a procedure for reporting pupil attendance, working with things, is an example of a technical skill.

Human skill is an administrator's ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort within the team he leads--working with people. An example would be the ability to

work cooperatively with teachers, supervisors, and consultants in planning curriculum revision.

Conceptual skill involves the ability to see the enterprise as a whole. Coordinating and integrating all of the activities and interests of the various teachers, specialists and auxiliary personnel toward a common objective requires a conceptual skill on the part of the elementary school principal. These three types of skills, which are interrelated, were used as a premise when the literature was examined to define the task areas of the elementary principal. When the task areas were defined, skills were listed under each of them.

These areas of responsibility with the listed skills are as follows:

I. Instruction and Curriculum Development

- A. Formulating curriculum objectives
- B. Determining curriculum content and organization
- C. Relating the desired curriculum to available time, physical facilities and needs of students.
- D. Providing materials, resources and equipment for the instructional program
- E. Providing for the supervision of instruction
- F. Providing for in-service education of instructional personnel

II. Pupil Personnel

- A. Maintaining a system of child accounting and attendance

B. Providing health and counseling services to students

C. Arranging for the continual assessment and interpretation of pupil growth

D. Establishing means of dealing with pupil discipline

III. Staff Personnel

A. Providing for the recruitment of staff personnel, selection and assigning them and developing a system of staff personnel records

B. Providing opportunities for professional growth of staff personnel

C. Assigning staff personnel on the basis of interests and strengths

IV. Community School Leadership

A. Providing educational services for the improvement of community life

B. Establishing two-way communications with parents on areas of mutual interest

V. Organization and Structure

A. Developing a staff organization as a means of implementing the educational objectives of the school program

VI. School Plant and School Transportation

A. Developing an efficient program of operation and maintenance of the physical plant

B. Providing for the safety of pupils and personnel

C. Utilizing the facilities to meet the needs of the instructional program

VII. School Finance and Business Management

A. Preparing the School Budget

B. Budget Approval

C. Budget Administration

D. Accounting for school monies

Subsequently, an appropriate set of items was designed to correspond with the skills which had been identified. Throughout the construction of the items, much information was sought from the literature (Sac, 1968). The items encompassed all three types of skills - technical, human and conceptual skills. The class of item used was basically the nondisguised - structured in which the respondent was given accurate information about the purpose of the questionnaire but was restricted in his responses by the investigator. However, to ensure accuracy, the category "Other" was added as a possible response in many of the items.

After the questions were formulated, they were critiqued by five expert practitioners: elementary school principals working independently of one another. Their suggestions were incorporated in a revised form of the questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire may be found in Appendix A.

The Cover Letter

In order to introduce the purpose and importance of the study to respondents, a cover letter (see Appendix B) was written and enclosed with the questionnaire. The literature and the investigator's adviser provided guidelines for the construction of this letter.

Distribution of the Questionnaire

On January 23, 1973, the questionnaire, cover letter and a

self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to the principals included in the sample. The questionnaire that principals from innovative schools received was blue and the questionnaire that principals from more traditional schools received was white.

A follow-up postcard (see Appendix C) mailed to non-respondents ten days later, yielded a 95.3 per cent response. Because of this high percentage, additional questionnaires were not sent to the remaining non-respondents.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study include the following:

1. The attempt was made to identify all of the principals of innovative schools listed in the MESPA 1971-72 directory. Thus the responses in the questionnaire from principals in innovative schools may be regarded as representative of all innovative schools in the Minneapolis-St.Paul suburban area. In order to get an equal number of principals from more traditional schools, a random sample was taken from the remainder of the listed membership. The assumption is that the responses of this random sample of principals of more traditional schools are representative of all the principals of more traditional schools in the Minneapolis-St.Paul suburban area.

2. Despite the scholarly procedure involved in the construction of the questionnaire, interpretations by respondents of questions could bias the study.

3. Research in the area of principals' perceptions of their roles is not abundant and therefore few precedents existed upon which to base the questionnaire constructed for this study.

4. The population chosen reflects the Minneapolis-St.Paul suburban area. However, because the questionnaire contains some descriptive data about principals, schools and school districts, it may be possible to relate the findings to other situations.

CHAPTER IV

THE RESULTS

This section is devoted to the presentation of the results of the questionnaire. Data tables accompanied by appropriate narrative are used in the presentation. The approach in presenting the results is descriptive. Responses of the sample of principals from innovative schools are sometimes compared to responses from the more traditional schools. Total figures were also tabulated.

For most questions, the tables show percentage of responses according to categories offered to the respondents in the questionnaire. These questions are fixed-alternative questions. An example of a fixed-alternative question is: "How long have you been a principal?" Possible responses were: "under 3 years"; "3 to 10 years"; "over 10 years". In such cases, the number of persons responding to the question is shown in the table as N=30. In a few cases the N (number responding) varies and does not equal the total number of respondents. The reasons are: 1) the respondent did not answer the question, 2) respondents could choose to select more than one alternative. Responses were tabulated for innovative schools, traditional schools and total responses.

With some questions, the respondent was given the opportunity to indicate that none of the responses was appropriate. This was done by providing a choice marked "other". An example of this type

of open-ended question is: "Which organizational pattern best describes your school?"

Vertical organization

_____ Graded school

_____ Non graded school

_____ Multi-age grouping

_____ Other (please specify)

Tables with responses of this kind of question show the frequency of replies and a summary of what was written in the "other" category.

In all tables, the heading "I" was used to designate responses of principals of innovative schools; "T" to designate responses of principals of traditional schools.

Personal Data of the Respondents And Their Schools

In an attempt to describe selected personal characteristics of the principals, their school districts and their schools, six questions were asked.

Table I

Length of Time as a Principal

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Under 3 years	12.9	-	6.6
3 to 10 years	29.0	33.3	31.1
Over 10 years	58.1	66.7	62.3

There were no principals in traditional schools who had fewer than 3 years experience as compared to 12.9 per cent in innovative schools.

Table 2

Length of Time as Principal in Present Building

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Under 3 years	13.3	16.1	14.8
3 to 10 years	80.0	48.4	63.9
Over 10 years	6.7	35.5	21.3

Fewer principals (6.7 per cent) in innovative schools have been in their building over 10 years compared to those in traditional buildings (35.5 per cent). Most principals in I schools (80.0 per cent) have been in their present buildings from 3 to 10 years.

Table 3

Enrollment in Present School

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Under 500	23.3	22.6	23.0
500 to 800	70.0	74.2	72.1
Over 800	6.7	3.2	4.9

Enrollment figures do not appear to be significantly different between innovative and traditional schools except for those with enrollment over 800. About twice as many I schools (6.7 per cent) have enrollments over 800 compared to Tr schools (3.2 per cent). About 72 per cent of the total number of schools have enrollment figures between 500 and 800 students. Only about 5 per cent of the schools have more than 800 students.

Table 4

Number of Elementary Schools in District

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Under 5	16.7	6.5	11.5
5 to 10	26.7	67.7	47.5
11 to 15	50.0	12.9	31.2
Over 15	6.7	12.9	9.8

Most innovative schools are in the larger districts. Over half (56.7 per cent) of innovative schools are in districts with more than 10 elementary schools. Only about one-fourth of the traditional schools (25.8 per cent) are in the larger districts.

Table 5

Support Personnel Available in Schools

Item	I (N=30)	Tr (N=31)	Total (N=61)	I (N=30)	Tr (N=31)	Total (N=61)
	Part-time			Full-time		
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Assistant to the principal	10.0	22.6	16.4	6.7	3.2	4.9
Speech therapist	93.3	96.8	95.1	6.7	-	3.3
Social worker	16.7	25.8	21.3	-	-	-
Psychologist	96.7	93.5	95.1	3.3	-	1.6
Art teacher	33.3	38.7	36.1	20.0	-	9.8
Music teacher	46.7	38.7	42.6	53.3	54.8	54.1
Physical Education teacher	40.0	41.9	41.0	46.7	45.2	45.9
Curriculum consultants	56.7	35.5	45.9	6.7	3.2	4.9
Nurse	96.7	93.6	95.1	3.3	6.5	4.9
Tutors	86.7	48.5	67.2	5.7	6.5	6.6
Resource teachers	36.7	19.4	27.9	26.7	29.0	27.9
Other	30.0	29.0	29.6	20.0	29.0	24.6

It appears that the number of support personnel in the schools varies. Most schools, however, have the services of a speech therapist (95.1 per cent part-time and 3.3 per cent full-time), a psychologist (95.1 per cent part-time and 1.6 per cent full-time), and a nurse (95.1 per cent part-time and 4.9 per cent full-time). Also most schools have the services of music teachers (42.6 per cent part-time and 54.1 per cent full-time) and

physical education teachers (41 per cent part-time and 45.9 per cent full-time). More part-time resource teachers are available to innovative schools (36.7 per cent) compared to traditional schools (19.4 per cent) as well as tutors--86.7 per cent part-time in innovative schools compared to 48.5 per cent in traditional ones.

Table 6

Vertical Organizational Pattern of Schools

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Graded School	46.7	100	73.8
Non graded school	20.0	-	9.8
Multi-age grouping	73.3	-	36.1
Other	6.7	-	3.3

Respondents from innovative schools checked more than one category in many cases--graded school plus one of the others. It suggests that there are combinations of vertical organizational patterns such as graded K-3 and non graded in 4-6. The "other" category included responses and combinations of the above categories.

The overall data suggest that about three-fourths (73.8 per cent) of all the schools have some form of graded vertical organization.

Table 7

Horizontal Organizational Pattern of Schools

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Modified self-contained classrooms	26.7	77.4	52.5
Partial Departmentalization	23.3	35.5	29.5
Dual Progress Plan	-	-	-
Cooperative Teaching	20.0	6.5	13.1
Team Teaching	86.7	16.1	50.8
Horizontal classification of students e.g. ability grouping	20.0	19.4	19.7
Other	20.0	-	9.8

In a few cases, both innovative and traditional schools checked more than one category to describe the horizontal organization of the school. The majority of innovative schools (86.7 per cent) have team teaching compared to only 16.1 per cent of more traditional schools. The modified self-contained classroom is far more prevalent in the more traditional school (77.4 per cent) than in the innovative schools (26.7 per cent). Some of the respondents from innovative schools who checked the "other" category included such responses at "traditional classrooms at each level", "range of ability in each room", "Individually Guided Education (IGE)," "modified to open teams".

About half the classrooms of the total group are self-contained (52.5 per cent) as well as having a team-teaching situation (50.8 per cent).

Instruction and Curriculum Development

This section consisted of eight questions which sought to determine where the primary responsibility for instruction and curriculum development lay.

Table 8

The Accomplishment of the Formulation of Curriculum Objectives

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
The central office (e.g. curriculum committee)	20.0	48.4	34.4
The principal	-	-	-
The principal and teachers	60.0	45.2	52.5
The teachers	-	-	-
Other	20.0	6.5	13.1

The central office plays a larger part in the formulation of curriculum objectives in the more traditional schools (48.4 per cent) than it does in the innovative schools (20.0 per cent). Some of the responses under the "other" category for the innovative schools

included "principal, teachers and central office", "Instructional Improvement Committee composed of teachers", "principal and unit coordinators", "curriculum coordinator and teachers". Thus in 80 per cent of innovative schools, the responsibility for the formulation of curriculum objectives lies with teachers who are involved with the principal and/or other curriculum personnel.

Table 9

The Accomplishment of the Determination of Curriculum Content

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
The central office	23.3	19.4	21.3
The principal	-	-	-
The principal and teachers	53.3	51.6	52.5
The teachers	10.0	6.5	8.2
Other	13.3	22.6	18.0

There appear to be no great differences between the I schools and the Tr ones with respect to the determining of curriculum content. The central office is responsible in about one-fifth of all schools (21.3 per cent) while in more than one-half (52.5 per cent) the principal and teachers share the responsibility. Responses in the "other" category included "curriculum coordinating committees composed of teachers", "principals, teachers and central office", "district curriculum committee".

Table 10

Implementation of Curriculum--Scheduling and Physical Facilities

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Teachers do most of the implementing	3.3	3.2	3.3
The principal does most of the implementing	6.7	22.6	14.8
The principal and teachers share the responsibility	86.7	74.2	80.3
Other	3.3	-	1.6

The principal and teachers share the responsibility in most cases for the implementation of the curriculum in both T schools (86.7 per cent) and Tr schools (74.2 per cent). A higher proportion of principals do implementing in Tr schools (22.6 per cent) compared to T schools (6.7 per cent).

Table 11

Implementation of Curriculum with Respect to Needs of Students such as Ability Grouping, Special Placements

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Teachers do most of the implementing	26.7	19.4	23.0
The principal does most of the implementing	-	-	-
The principal and teachers share the responsibility	70.0	80.6	75.4
Other	3.3	-	1.6

In placing students according to their curriculum needs, the

principal and teachers share the responsibility in most of the schools (75.4 per cent). In the T schools, the "other" category included "teacher with the team", "principal with leaders outside of team". In no schools does the principal do most of the implementing of curriculum independent of the teachers.

Table 12

Selection of Materials, Resources and Equipment for the Instructional Program

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Mainly by the teachers	13.3	22.6	18.0
Mainly by the principal	-	-	-
Jointly by the teachers and the principal	80.0	74.2	77.0
Other	6.7	3.2	5.0

Selection of materials, resources and equipment for the instructional program is done jointly by the principal and the teachers in most of the schools (77.0 per cent). "Other" responses included "Instructional Improvement Committee", "Principal and unit coordinators", "District Curriculum Committee". In no schools does the principal select materials, resources and equipment independently.

Table 13

Planned Program for the Supervision of Instruction

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	83.3	90.3	86.9
No	16.7	9.7	13.1

Most of the schools (86.9 per cent) have a planned program for the supervision of instruction. More Tr schools have these planned programs (90.3 per cent) than do I schools (83.3 per cent).

Table 14

Responsibility for Supervision of Instruction

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
The sole responsibility of the principal	36.7	67.7	52.5
The joint responsibility of the principal and teachers	56.7	19.4	37.7
Mainly the responsibility of the teachers	-	-	-
Other	6.7	12.9	9.8

The responsibility for the supervision of instruction belongs to the principal in the majority of traditional schools (67.7 per cent) as compared to the I schools (36.7 per cent). Replies in the "other"

category included "instructional assistant and central office", "supervisors in curriculum areas", "principal and teaching consultant", "Instructional Improvement Committee, principal and unit coordinators", "Coordinator of Elementary school services, principal and teachers".

Table 15

Planned Program for the Evaluation of Teachers

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	93.3	96.8	95.1
No	6.7	3.2	4.9

Most of the schools (95.1 per cent) have a planned program for the evaluation of teachers.

Table 16

Responsibility for Evaluation of Teachers

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
The sole responsibility of the principal	53.3	77.4	65.6
The joint responsibility of the principal and teachers in that teachers have some input about colleagues	40.0	9.7	24.6
Mainly the responsibility of the teachers	-	-	-
Other	6.7	12.9	9.8

In innovative schools, 40 per cent of teachers have some input

about colleagues in evaluation compared to 9.7 per cent for Tr schools. In 65.6 per cent of all schools, evaluation of teachers is the sole responsibility of the principal. Responses in the "other" category included "principal and teacher's self-evaluation", principal and teaching consultant", "principal and elementary coordinator". In more than three-fourths of Tr schools (77.4 per cent) the evaluation of teachers is the sole responsibility of the principal compared to about one-half (53.3 per cent) in I schools.

Table 17

Availability of In-Service Education

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	100	100	100
No	-	-	-

In-service education is available to the staff of all the schools in the sample.

Table 18

Source of In-Service Education

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Planned by the school district	76.7	87.1	82.0
Planned and implemented within your school	66.7	71.0	68.9
Major planning is done by the principal	3.3	12.9	8.2
Major planning is shared by the principal and teachers	76.7	74.2	75.4
Made available to teachers from other sources	46.7	61.3	54.1

It appears that in-service education is available to teachers from sources within the school district, within the school and from other sources. Teachers participate in the planning in 75.4 per cent of the schools where in-service is planned and implemented within the school. More in-service education is made available to teachers from other sources in Tr schools (61.3 per cent) than in I schools (46.7 per cent).

Pupil Personnel

This section of the questionnaire explored several aspects of involvement with pupils by the central office, the principal and teachers. Four questions were asked dealing with data on pupils, counseling and referral service, pupil growth and discipline.

Table 19

Responsibility for Collecting and Interpreting Data on Student Enrollment and Attendance -

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
The central office	43.3	51.6	47.5
The principal	36.7	35.5	36.1
The teachers	-	-	-
The principal and teachers	13.3	9.7	11.5
Other	6.7	3.2	4.9

For the entire sample of schools, the major responsibility for collecting and interpreting data on student enrollment and attendance is accomplished by either the central office in 47.5 per cent of cases or by the principal in 36.1 per cent of cases. No major differences appear between traditional and innovative schools. Replies under "other" suggested that "office secretaries", or "local school office" were responsible for this data.

Table 20

Counseling or Referral Service

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	83.3	93.5	88.5
No	16.7	6.5	11.5

Although most of the schools have some type of counseling service,

the Tr schools have a slightly higher proportion (93.5 per cent) with this service than the I schools (83.3 per cent).

Table 21

Responsibility for Assessing Effectiveness of Referral Service

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
The principal has the major responsibility for assessing the effectiveness of these services to pupils	8.0	31.0	20.4
Teachers share the responsibility in assessing the effectiveness of these services	92.0	69.0	79.6

In innovative schools, teachers share the responsibility in assessing the effectiveness of referral services in more cases (92.0 per cent) than in traditional schools (69.0 per cent).

Table 22

Assessment and Interpretation of Pupil Growth

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Accomplished mainly by the pupils' teachers	43.3	48.4	45.9
Accomplished by teachers with the direct participation of the principal	36.7	35.5	36.1
Accomplished by indirect participation of the principal through policy formulation	20.0	16.1	18.0
Other	-	-	-

In almost one-half of the schools (45.9 per cent) continual assessment and interpretation of pupil growth is accomplished mainly by the pupils' teachers; in more than one-third (36.1 per cent) of schools assessment and interpretation are accomplished by the teachers of pupil growth with direct participation of the principal; in 18.0 per cent of schools they are accomplished by indirect participation of the principal through policy formulation. No great differences appear to exist between I and Tr schools.

Table 23

Pupil Discipline

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
There is no established procedure	46.7	10.7	29.3
Teachers make final decisions	-	3.6	1.7
A policy where the principal makes final decisions has been established	26.7	53.6	39.7
Other	26.7	32.1	29.3

In 46.7 per cent of I schools there is no established procedure with respect to pupil discipline compared to Tr schools where the percentage is 10.7 per cent. The principal makes final decisions in 53.6 per cent of Tr schools compared to 26.7 per cent in I schools.

Staff Personnel

The following section explores how staff personnel are recruited, how personnel records are kept and how instructional assignments are made. This section is comprised of four questions.

Table 24

Principal Involvement in the Recruitment of Staff Personnel

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	100	87.1	93.4
No	-	12.9	6.6

All principals (100 per cent) in innovative schools and most (87.1 per cent) in traditional schools have some part in the recruitment of staff personnel.

Table 25

Selection of Staff Personnel

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
By the central office	-	12.9	6.6
By the central office in consultation with the principal	26.7	32.2	29.5
By the central office with the approval of the principal	26.7	41.9	34.4
Other	46.6	12.9	29.5

In innovative schools about one-half (53.4 per cent) of the principals indicated that the selection of staff personnel is the

joint responsibility of the central office and the principal compared to 74.1 per cent in traditional schools. While none of I schools reported the central office as having the sole responsibility in this area, 12.9 per cent of Tr schools did. A significant number of I schools (46.6 per cent) responded to the "other" category along with 12.9 per cent of Tr schools. Many of these responses indicated that the teachers had some input into staff selection or that the principal had the major responsibility in consultation with the central office. A fourth category would have clarified the large percentage response in the category labeled "other".

Table 26

Maintenance of Staff Personnel Records by the Principal

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	50	67.7	59.0
No	50	32.2	41.0

About two-thirds of principals in Tr schools (67.7 per cent) maintain a system of staff personnel records compared to 50 per cent of those in I schools.

Table 27

Instructional Assignments Made on the Basis of Individual Interests and Strengths

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	100	77.4	88.5
No	-	22.6	11.5

Instructional assignments are made on the basis of interests and strengths in all (100 per cent) of I schools and in 77.4 per cent of Tr schools.

Community School Leadership

The data in this section examine the communications between the principal and the community.

Table 28

Meetings Between Principal and the Community Other Than Parents

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Frequently	30.0	19.4	24.6
Occasionally	50.0	51.6	50.8
Rarely	16.7	29.0	23.0
Never	3.3	-	1.6

More principals of I schools (80.0 per cent) reportedly meet

with members of the community other than parents either occasionally or frequently than do principals of Tr schools (70.0 per cent).

Table 29

Means of Communication Between the Principal and the Community

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Principal's Newsletter	93.3	61.3	77.1
PTA Meetings	83.3	80.6	82.0
Parents'study groups	40.0	16.1	27.9
Orientation for new parents	33.3	25.8	29.5
Coverage of school events in a local newspaper	70.0	74.2	72.1
Other	20.0	38.7	29.5

"Principal's Newsletter" "PTA Meetings" and "Coverage of school events in a local newspaper" are the responses most frequently selected by principals to describe their communication with the community on a regular basis. "Parents' study groups" is selected by principals in I schools more frequently (40 per cent) compared to principals of Tr schools (16.1 per cent). Responses in the "other" category included "District newsletter", "notes to parents", Coffee break every Wednesday", "information meetings", "volunteer aides", "coffee parties in neighborhood", "Parent advisory committee", "memos", "radio announcements".

Respondents from I schools selected the Principals' Newsletter more frequently (93.3 per cent) than did respondents from Tr schools (61.3 per cent). Parents' study groups were also selected more frequently by I schools (40.0 per cent) than Tr schools (16.1 per cent).

Organization and Structure

Changes in organization and structure are examined in this section.

Table 30

Freedom to Change Organizational Pattern

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	93.3	83.9	88.5
No	6.7	16.1	11.5

Most schools are free to change the organizational pattern (88.5 per cent of the total). More Tr schools are not free to initiate this (16.1 per cent) compared to I schools (6.7 per cent).

Table 31

Organizational Changes Within the Past Five Years

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	100	87.1	93.4
No	-	12.9	6.6

The last 5 years have seen organizational changes in 100 per cent of I schools and in 87.1 per cent of Tr schools.

Table 32

Source of Organizational Changes

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=27) %	Total (N=57) %
The central office	-	18.5	8.8
The principal	3.3	3.7	3.5
The principal and the staff	90.0	66.7	78.9
The staff	3.3	7.4	5.3
Other	3.3	3.7	3.5

Organizational changes in most innovative schools have been initiated by the principal and the staff (90.0 per cent) compared to

66.7 per cent of Tr schools. The central office was not responsible for initiating changes in any of the I schools but did so in 18.5 per cent of Tr schools.

Table 33

Areas Where Changes Have Occurred

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=27) %	Total (N=57) %
Team teaching and planning	96.7	55.6	72.2
Cooperative teaching	26.7	59.3	42.1
Differentiated staffing	60.0	3.7	33.3
Change in the physical plant	63.3	22.2	43.9
Programmed instruction	26.7	22.2	24.7
Multi-age grouping	83.3	33.3	59.6
Other	13.3	29.6	21.1

The data seem to indicate that within the last 5 years organizational changes have occurred in both I and Tr schools. There is some question as to the definition of terms and the extent of the changes. For example 33.3 per cent of Tr schools report that multi-age grouping is an organizational change occurring within the last 5 years. However on the identifying data of the questionnaires, all the respondents described the vertical organization of their schools as "graded".

School Plant and School Transportation

This section is devoted to examining data concerning selection and maintenance of custodial personnel, evaluation of the maintenance program, maintenance of a safety program and modification of plant facilities.

Table 34

Selection of Maintenance and Custodial Personnel By the Principal

Item	I (N=33) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=64) %
Has nothing to say	30.3	32.3	31.3
May accept or reject personnel	27.3	25.8	26.6
May make recommendations	42.4	35.5	39.1
May make decisions independent of the central office	-	3.2	1.6
Other	-	3.2	1.6

In general, in 31.3 per cent of the schools the principal has nothing to say about the selection of maintenance and custodial personnel. However in the majority of cases (65.7 per cent) principals do have some input by either making recommendations about maintenance and custodial personnel or by having the option of accepting or rejecting them.

Table 35

Evaluation of Maintenance Program By the Principal

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=29) %	Total (N=59) %
On a regular basis	36.7	58.6	47.5
Occasionally	46.7	20.7	33.9
Rarely	16.7	13.8	15.3
Never	-	6.9	3.4

In I schools 36.7 per cent of principals evaluated the maintenance program on a regular basis compared to 58.6 per cent in Tr schools. More principals in I schools (46.7 per cent) were involved in the evaluation of the maintenance program on an occasional basis than in Tr schools (20.7 per cent).

Table 36

Maintenance of a Safety Program Such As Safety Patrols

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Mainly by the teachers	13.3	3.2	8.2
By the teachers with the direct participation of the principal	43.3	54.8	49.2
By indirect participation of the principal through policy formulation	36.7	22.6	29.5
Other	6.7	19.4	13.1

The responsibility for the maintenance of a safety program is

shared by the principal and the teachers in 49.2 per cent of the schools where the principal participates directly and in 29.5 per cent of the schools where he participates indirectly. Some of the "other" replies included "patrol supervisor and principal", "assistant to the principal", "teacher paid extra for the duty".

Table 37

Principals' Ability to Modify Plant Facilities

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
Yes	76.7	54.8	65.6
No	23.3	45.2	34.4

A greater proportion (76.7 per cent) of principals in innovative schools have freedom to modify plant facilities to meet the needs of the educational program than in traditional schools (34.4 per cent).

School Finance and Business Management

An attempt was made to determine to what extent principals were involved in the preparation of the school budget, budget approval, budget administration and accounting of monies to both the central office and staff. This section examines these data.

Table 38

Preparation of the Budget

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=31) %	Total (N=61) %
The central office	36.7	48.4	42.6
The principal	-	16.2	8.2
The principal and the teachers	50.0	32.3	41.0
The teachers under the supervision of the principal	-	3.2	1.6
Other	13.3	-	6.6

The responses under "other" included "central office, teachers and principals", "each school given a per pupil amount of money to be administered by principal and teachers". Thus it appears that in 63.3 per cent of innovative schools, the teachers are involved along with the principal in the preparation of the budget compared to 35.5 per cent in Tr schools.

Table 39

Budget Approval

Item	I (N=30) %	Tr (N=29) %	Total (N=59) %
By the central office with little input from the principal	23.3	20.7	22.0
By the central office after the principal has the opportunity to explain and defend it	63.3	79.3	71.2
Other	13.3	-	6.8

The "other" categories included replies such as "Board of Education", "Principal and Director of Business Affairs". In 71.2 per cent of the sample, the principal has the opportunity to explain and defend the budget to the central office.

Table 40

Budget Administration

Item	I (N=29) %	Tr (N=29) %	Total (N=58) %
By the principal mainly	41.4	41.4	41.4
By the principal and the staff	51.7	51.7	51.7
Other	6.9	6.9	6.9

Replies in the "other" category included "Principal and Instructional Improvement Committee" and "Central office". In 51.7 per cent of the

total sample, the staff is involved along with the principal in the administration of the budget.

Table 41

Accounting for School Monies on a Regular Basis to the Central Office By the Principal

Item	I (N=28) %	Tr (N=29) %	Total (N=57) %
Yes	92.9	82.8	87.7
No	7.1	17.2	12.3

Most principals in both I and Tr schools account for school monies on a regular basis to the central office--87.7 per cent of the total sample.

Table 42

Accounting for School Monies on a Regular Basis to the Staff By the School Principal

Item	I (N=26) %	Tr (N=27) %	Total (N=53) %
Yes	50.0	66.7	58.5
No	50.0	33.3	41.5

About two-thirds of the respondents from Tr schools (66.7 per cent) account for school monies on a regular basis to the staff compared to one-half from I schools (50.0 per cent).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The Problem and Its Importance

In Chapter I, educational supervision was defined as a creative and dynamic role of organizational leadership for the purpose of improving the teaching-learning situation. Within the framework of this definition, the change in the role of elementary school principal was examined and the factors which influenced this change. The change was seen to be in the direction of cooperative responsibility of the principal and the staff to improve the teaching-learning situation. Innovations in schools were viewed as an attempt to meet the new challenges in education.

This study attempted to investigate how elementary school principals in innovative schools perceive their roles compared to the role perceptions of principals in more traditional school settings.

Related Literature

Chapter II reviewed articles on the changing scope of and the emphases in the role of the elementary school principal. The principal's role emerged as one that has attained a higher degree of professionalization; that can anticipate increased involvement of teaching personnel in decision making; that must be concerned with the relationship between the input in education such as money spent and the output which is student learning.

This chapter also reported on research studies which sought to establish a causal relationship between competencies exercised by the principal and resultant examples of effective leadership. The relationship between administrative performance and organizational output was shown to be indirect since this output is dependent upon the efforts of many other people. However, most of the data reflected the growth of responsibilities and the improving preparation of elementary school principals.

Procedure of the Study--Sampling and Questionnaire

The design of the study was described in Chapter III. Thirty-two schools listed in the 1972 Directory of the Suburban Division of the Minnesota Elementary School Principals' Association were designated as innovative by a panel of four elementary school principals. It was assumed that the responses of a random sample of an equal number of principals of more traditional schools from the same directory were representative of all elementary school principals in more traditional schools.

A six page questionnaire was mailed out to respondents. The questionnaire consisted of items designed to provide descriptive data about the principal and the school and items concerned with experiences or activities of the principals in various task areas. These task areas included:

1. Instruction and Curriculum Development
2. Pupil Personnel
3. Staff Personnel

4. Community School Leadership
5. Organization and Structure of the School
6. School Plant and School Transportation
7. School Finance and Business Management

The type of items used was the nondisguised-structured in which the respondent was given accurate information about the purpose of the questionnaire but was restricted in his responses by the investigator. The 61 responses represented 95.3 per cent of the sample which was judged to provide sufficient data to compare role perceptions of principals in innovative and more traditional schools.

Discussion of the Data

Chapter IV included the analysis of the responses to the questionnaires. These data were presented in the form of tables and descriptive narrative. Percentages were calculated for innovative school responses, traditional school responses and total responses.

Significant Observations of this Study and Their Implications

1. Whereas the length of experience of all principals in the sample was somewhat the same, a much larger proportion of principals from innovative schools had been in their buildings from 3 to 10 years.

   One possible explanation is that many innovative schools have been constructed within the last 10 years and principals have moved to these buildings

to initiate new programs. In addition, principals whose interests are in the direction of innovation, may move to schools or to districts where physical plant facilities are conducive to innovation.

2. Innovative schools appeared to be in the larger districts while the majority of the more traditional schools were in the smaller districts.

Facilities and personnel in larger school districts may accommodate themselves better to innovation. For example, the central office in larger school districts has more schools to service. With a larger staff, decentralization may be regarded as the solution to meeting the needs of a particular school. More autonomy thus might lead to the initiating of new programs. Generally, larger school districts also have greater fiscal resources as well as a greater number and variety of resources and personnel. Innovations which require the utilization of specialized personnel, a variety of resources and greater fiscal resources may thus be more easily implemented in larger districts. Expectations of parents may not be as uniform in larger school districts as in the smaller school districts. These varied expectations in larger school districts may add the impetus needed for innovations to occur.

3. All schools had varied support personnel. Psychologists, speech therapists and nurses were available to all schools, but innovative schools appeared to have more tutors and resource teachers.

This finding is consistent with a survey which was referred to in an earlier chapter of this paper (Department of Elementary School Principals, 1968). It stated that there has been an increase in the availability of speech specialists, psychologists, reading specialists, specialists in science and librarians in elementary schools. The findings in this study, that innovative schools appear to have more tutors and resource teachers, may have two explanations. The first may be that because more innovative schools are in larger districts, more resources and therefore tutors are available to them. The second may be that the emphasis on individualized types of instruction in the innovative schools causes some of the resources to be spent in areas which reinforce this type of instruction. Tutors and resource people are examples of expenditures which emphasize individual needs. It appears that the very nature of many of the organizational patterns in the innovative schools necessitates greater use of para-professionals.

4. The graded school was the most common type of vertical organization. Many innovative schools have some form of a graded structure. Multi-age grouping was the most common vertical organization in innovative schools.

These findings suggest that some innovative schools may be progressing toward multi-age grouping in stages since many of these schools still have graded classrooms; or the graded classroom in the innovative school may be considered to be one more option for meeting the individual needs of students and therefore is a permanent organizational feature of some innovative schools. A "school within a school", which has both multi-age grouping and self-contained classrooms, is an example of this type of option.

5. In horizontal organization, team teaching was most common in the innovative schools and the modified self-contained classroom was the most common pattern in more traditional schools.

Horizontal organization reflects vertical structure. Such vertical organization as multi-age grouping in innovative schools cannot usually function with just one teacher because vertical organization requires extensive communication about students and curriculum among teachers. Team teaching meets these requirements. A graded vertical organization, which exists in a more traditional school, can continue to have one teacher in a modified self-contained classroom.

6. Teachers and principals shared many of the responsibilities in the instruction and curriculum development areas in both innovative and more traditional schools. However, the central office played a larger part in the formation of objectives in more traditional schools than in innovative ones.

The sharing of responsibilities by teachers in instruction and curriculum development supports the idea that, generally, administrators can anticipate increased involvement of teaching personnel in decision making (Barbee, 1972). Innovative schools are one step further in that more of them are involved in the formation of objectives than are more traditional schools.

7. In none of the cases did the principal implement the curriculum with respect to such things as needs of students, or the selection of materials, resources and equipment for the instructional program independently of the teachers.

Again this observation reinforces the literature which states that teaching personnel will become more involved in decision making (Barbee, 1972). The advanced training of teachers and their increasing professionalism are some of the factors which explain this added involvement.

8. Teachers had more input in evaluation of teachers in innovative schools compared to more traditional schools. Evaluation of teachers was the sole responsibility of the principal in a greater number of more traditional schools than in innovative schools.

Most innovative schools utilize some form of team teaching. Interpersonal relationships may be

the key to a successful team teaching situation; working closely in a team necessitates open communications. The logical result may be input by teachers in the evaluation of their colleagues. Also, because a principal meets with team leaders, who are responsible for directing the team, he may need to be cognizant of and solicit the leaders' evaluations of the team members. In more traditional schools with self-contained classrooms, communication about colleagues is not as vital to the functioning of the classroom teacher as in a team-teaching situation. The door of a classroom may remain closed. Thus, in order to be effective, teachers in a traditional school probably need less input about their peers and also have less basis for input. The result may be that the evaluation of teachers becomes the sole responsibility of the principal in a more traditional school.

9. In-service education was available to all teachers and from many sources.

The continuing professional education of teachers is very evident. They are becoming, as a whole, better trained and more professional. This increasing professionalization coincides with the advances made in the preparation for the

principalship (Department of Elementary School Principals, 1968). While in-service education is essential to the initiation and maintenance of innovation, responses to the questionnaire would indicate that continuing professional education is also deemed necessary in the more traditional schools.

10. Assessment of referral services had involvement by teachers in more cases in innovative schools. There was less such involvement by teachers in more traditional schools.

This finding tends to support a previous finding in this study which shows that teachers have more input in evaluation of teachers in innovative schools compared to more traditional ones. When teachers work with referral staff as closely and directly as they do with team members, collegial evaluation would tend to be a valid basis for the assessment of referral services.

11. The procedure dealing with discipline was more flexible in innovative schools than in more traditional schools. In traditional schools, principals tended to make final decisions.

The premise that the direction of innovation in schools is to meet individual needs of students more adequately is substantiated here. Discipline can only be effective if it is personal; if it is related to the individual child. A flexible policy in discipline in the innovative school suggests that these schools

are considering the individual needs of students and are not disciplining according to an absolute standard which in many cases may be referral to the principal. Because more teachers in traditional schools refer students to the principal for final decisions in discipline, it suggests that the emphasis on individual needs of students may not be as great in more traditional schools as in more innovative schools.

12. In innovative schools the principal and teachers were more involved in the selection of staff personnel than were principals and teachers in more traditional schools.

This observation should be considered in connection with another finding stated earlier in this chapter. It is that teachers have more input in the evaluation of teachers in innovative schools. If this greater input is due to the close interpersonal relationships in a team-teaching situation, as was suggested, then it is reasonable to believe that the selection of staff personnel would have the direct involvement not only of the principal but also of the teachers. This involvement might facilitate to some degree, the selection of teachers whose strengths, interests and personalities would be harmonious with those of the other members of the team.

13. All innovative schools reported that teaching assignments were made on the basis of interests and strengths.

When a team of teachers is attempting to meet the educational needs of a group of children in the elementary school, there is more room for specialization of interests and strengths. Each teacher need not attempt to be all things to all students. He is free to pursue his own interests and strengths and bring these to the team which collectively may better be able to accomplish the task of meeting children's individual needs. It appears that innovative schools are making this discovery.

14. All principals used a variety of methods to communicate with the community and most were involved with community members other than parents. Innovative schools made greater use of the Principal's Newsletter and Parent's Study Groups than did more traditional schools.

Accountability by the school to society is mentioned with great frequency in the literature (Lessinger, 1971). An earlier reference in this paper has been made to the responsibility of the principal in the area of accountability where both educators and society examine the relationship between input of resources, such as teachers, and output which is student learning. The communication with parents and other members of the community by the principal suggests that he is aware of this dimension of his

role. Because more change is taking place in education, there is need to make greater use of a variety of communication media. Principals in innovative schools appear to utilize some methods of communication more than do principals in more traditional schools. These methods seem to be directed more specifically to the school and its program and they may partially reflect the structure which seeks to meet the individual needs of students in the innovative schools.

15. Most principals had the freedom to change the organizational patterns of their schools. These organizational changes were initiated primarily by the principal and his staff in innovative schools and had occurred in most schools to some extent within the last 5 years. The central office was the cause of some organizational changes in more traditional schools.

Organizational changes in elementary schools are occurring with the main impetus coming from the principal and the staff. This suggests that principals are moving into a shared role with teachers with regard to organizing the school for instruction for the reasons discussed in greater detail in an earlier chapter. The reasons relate to the increased training and professionalization of both principals and teachers. In some traditional schools where principals and staff members do not take the initiative, organizational changes originate in the central office which suggests that educators other than teachers and principals are sensitive to the new challenges in education. These

educators may be acting as a result of the expressed or tacit wishes of the community.

16. Freedom to modify plant facilities was accorded to a greater proportion of principals in innovative schools compared to principals of more traditional schools.

Where principals in innovative schools do not have the freedom to modify plant facilities, the reason may be due to budget limitations rather than policies which restrict innovation. In cases where permission is not granted to modify plant facilities in more traditional schools, the reason may be that it is not justified since no organizational change is planned. However, it is impossible to discover from the data how many principals in more traditional schools would change the organizational structure and the plant facilities of their school if they were free to do so. It may be that resistance to the introduction of new ideas originates with the central office.

17. Teachers in innovative schools were generally more involved in the preparation of the budget than were teachers in more traditional schools.

An earlier reference to accountability and the relationship between input (resources) and output (pupil learning) has been made. The proper allocation of resources is crucial to any program. Where teachers are greatly involved in making decisions about the

needs of students, they must of necessity have some part in determining how the money is spent. The total budget may be fixed. However within the limits of the budget, priorities may be assigned by teachers. Innovative schools are apparently recognizing how essential it is for teachers to be able to participate in the preparation of the budget.

Conclusions

Although the conclusions presented here apply particularly to the geographical environs encompassed by this study, that is, the schools in the Minneapolis-St.Paul suburban districts, the general conclusion is suggested in many professional journal articles on education. This conclusion is that principals in innovative schools view their roles in supervision and administrative as a cooperative effort with teachers to improve the teaching-learning situation more than do principals in more traditional schools.

The following conclusions are made on the basis of the data collected in this study.

1. Innovative schools are more likely to be in the larger school districts.
2. Principals of innovative schools have been in their buildings from 3 to 10 years.
3. The last 5 years have witnessed changes in organizational patterns in all schools.

4. Innovative schools utilize the services of more resource teachers and tutors than do more traditional schools.
5. In innovative schools, multi-age grouping is the most common vertical organization and team-teaching the most common horizontal organization.
6. Although organizational changes have occurred in more traditional schools, the vertical organization is graded and the predominant horizontal organization is the modified self-contained classroom.
7. In all schools, there is a shared responsibility between principals and teachers in the area of instruction, curriculum development and implementation of the curriculum.
8. Innovative schools have a greater responsibility than more traditional schools in the formulation of objectives.
9. Teachers in innovative schools are participating more actively than teachers in more traditional schools in:
    a. the evaluation of their colleagues
    b. the area of student discipline
    c. the selection of staff personnel
    d. the preparation of the budget
    e. decisions pertaining to changes in the organizational pattern of the school
10. Principals in innovative schools have greater freedom to modify plant facilities than do principals in more traditional schools.

11. All principals communicate with parents and the community by utilizing various media.
12. In-service training is available to all teachers.

Recommendations

An analysis of the data collected in this study leads to the conclusion that principals in innovative schools are moving in the direction of a shared role with teachers with regard to educational supervision and administration. The evidence also reveals that organizational changes are occurring in all schools to some extent. The difficulty is to determine the relationship between administrative performance and organizational output. One of the dimensions of this difficulty is to decide whether the elementary school principal's primary role should be as an educational leader or as an expert in plant management and administrative detail. Principals in more traditional schools tend to view their roles primarily as ones of maintenance while the role perceptions of principals in innovative schools are ones of change. It has not been established whether the reasons for the differences in role perceptions of principals of innovative schools compared to principals of more traditional schools are due to self-limiting or to external factors. Another dimension is to determine how organizational patterns affect organizational output. Still another is simply to measure organizational output.

The areas in which research needs to be extended are:

1. The analysis of leadership needs for the future in the elementary school.
2. A role definition for principals based on the most recent available evidence of leadership needs.
3. Investigation of certification standards of elementary school principals to determine whether the standards are meeting the leadership needs of the elementary school.
4. In-depth research on the components of organizational output (i.e. student accomplishment or learning).
5. Adequate measures of the components of student accomplishment.
6. Studies to measure the relationship between various organizational patterns such as multi-age grouping and student accomplishment.
7. Studies to measure causal relationships between competencies exercised by the principal and resultant examples of effective leadership.
8. Studies probing more complex combinations of variables such as competencies exercised by the principal and resultant examples of effective leadership within various organizational frameworks.
9. Studies to determine what factors account for the differences in the role perceptions of principals of innovative schools compared to principals of more traditional schools.

There must be continuing emphases on research in educational supervision and administration that reflects awareness of previous developments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barbee, Don. "Administrative Implications of Differentiated Staffing", National Elementary Principal, volume LI, No.4, January, 1972.

Barnes, Fred P. Research for the Practitioner in Education. Washington: National Education Association, 1964.

Becker, Gerald, Richard Withycombe, Frank Doyel, Edgar Miller, Claude Morgan, Lou DeLoretto and Bill Aldridge. Elementary School Principals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence. Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 1971.

Bridges, Edwin M. "Bureaucratic Role and Socialization: The Influence of Experience on the Elementary Principal", Educational Administration Quarterly, 1:18:28; Spring, 1965.

Brown, Alan F. and John H. House. "The Organizational Component in Education", Review of Educational Research, Volume XXXVII, No. 4, October, 1967.

Campbell, Ronald, Luvern Cunningham, and Roderick McPhee. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.

Crotts, J.H. "Function of the Elementary Principal", School and Community, 50:28, May, 1968.

Curten, James. Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

Eaves, Robert W. "The Elementary School Principalship Since 1950--Some Observations", National Elementary Principal, Volume XLVIII, No. 6, May 1969.

Erickson, Donald A. "The School Administrator", Review of Educational Research, Volume XXXVII, No. 4, October, 1967.

Faber, Charles F. and Gilbert F. Shearron. Elementary School Administration. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1970.

Gallessech, June, Ira Iscoe and Sherry Payne. "Team Teaching: A Study of Team Development and Interpersonal Functioning", National Elementary Principal, Volume LI, No. 2, October, 1971.

Green, M. "Many Hats of an Elementary Principal's Job", School and Community, 54:10, January, 1968.

Halpin, Andrew W. and Don B. Croft. "The Organizational Climate of Schools", Administrator's Notebook, Volume II, No. 7, March, 1963.

Hamilton, James T. "Educational Administrators and Their Level of Self Actualization", Educational Leadership, March, 1971

Jahoda, Marie, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. 2 Vols. New York: Dryden Press, 1951.

James, Thomas H. "Politics and Community Decision Making in Education", Review of Educational Research, Volume XXXVII, No. 4, October, 1967.

Katz, Robert L. "Skills of an Effective Administrator", Harvard Business Review, Volume 33, January-February, 1955.

Lane, Willard R., Ronald G. Corwin, and William G. Monahan. Foundations of Educational Administration: A Behavioral Analysis. New York: Macmillan Company, 1967.

Lessinger, Leon M. "The Principal and Accountability", National Elementary Principal, Volume LI, No. 2, October, 1971.

McNally, H.J. "The Elementary Principal Tomorrow", The National Elementary Principal, 47:85-91, May, 1968.

National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals. Survey of the Elementary School Principalship, 1968.

Nystrand, Raphael O. and Frederick Bertolaet. "Strategies for Allocating Human and Material Resources", Review of Educational Research, Volume XXXVII, No. 4, October, 1967.

Otto, Henry J. and David C. Sanders. Elementary School Organization and Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

Powers, Thomas E. "Administrative Behavior and Upward Mobility", Administrator's Notebook, 14:1-4, September, 1966.

Rogers, Carl R. Freedom To Learn. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969.

Sax, Gilbert. Empirical Foundations of Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Sellitz, Claire, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

Swearingen, Mildred E. Supervision of Instruction: Foundations and Dimensions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962.

Thomas, Terry A. "Human Relations Training for Elementary School Principals", National Elementary Principal, Volume L, No. 6, May 1971.

Tye, Kenneth. "The Principal As a Change Agent", The National Elementary School Principal, Volume XLIX, No. 4, February, 1970.

Questionnaire 1.

1. How long have you been a principal?
   _____ under 3 years
   _____ 3 to 10 years
   _____ over 10 years

2. How long have you been a principal in your present building?
   _____ under 3 years
   _____ 3 to 10 years
   _____ over 10 years

3. What is the enrollment of your school?
   _____ under 500
   _____ 500 to 800
   _____ over 800

4. How many elementary schools are in your district?
   _____ under 5
   _____ 5 to 10
   _____ 11 to 15
   _____ over 15

5. Check which of the following support personnel you have available to your school.

	Part-time	Full-time
Assistant to the principal	_____	_____
Speech therapist	_____	_____
Social worker	_____	_____
Psychologist	_____	_____
Art teacher	_____	_____
Music teacher	_____	_____
Physical Education teacher	_____	_____
Curriculum consultants	_____	_____
Nurse	_____	_____
Tutors	_____	_____
Resource teachers	_____	_____
Other (please specify)	_____	_____
_____		

6. Which organizational pattern best describes your school?
   a. Vertical Organization

      _____ Graded school
      _____ Non graded school
      _____ Multi-age grouping
      _____ Other (please specify
      _____

   b. Horizontal Organization

      _____ Modified self-contained classrooms
      _____ Partial Departmentalization
      _____ Dual Progress Plan
      _____ Cooperative Teaching
      _____ Team Teaching
      _____ Horizontal classification of students e.g. ability grouping
      _____ Other (please specify)
      _____

NOTE: PLEASE CHECK ONLY THE ONE WHICH BEST REFLECTS THE SITUATION IN THE SCHOOL IN WHICH YOU ARE PRINCIPAL.

I. Instruction and Curriculum Development

A. The formulation of curriculum objectives is accomplished by
_____ the central office (e.g. curriculum committee, consultant)
_____ the principal
_____ the principal and teachers
_____ the teachers
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

B. Determining curriculum content is accomplished primarily by
_____ the central office
_____ the principal
_____ the principal and teachers
_____ the teachers
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

C. How is the curriculum implemented with respect to such things as scheduling and physical facilities?
_____ teachers do most of the implementing
_____ the principal does most of the implementing
_____ the principal and teachers share the responsibility
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

D. How is the curriculum implemented with respect to such things as needs of students (e.g. ability grouping, special placements)?
_____ teachers do most of the implementing
_____ the principal does most of the implementing
_____ the principal and teachers share the responsibility
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

E. Selection of materials, resources and equipment for the instructional program is done
_____ mainly by the teachers
_____ mainly by the principal
_____ jointly by the teachers and the principal
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

F. Is there a planned program for the supervision of instruction in your building?
_____ yes _____ no

The supervision of instruction is
_____ the sole responsibility of the principal
_____ the joint responsibility of the principal and teachers
_____ mainly the responsibility of the teachers
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

G. Is there a planned program for the evaluation of teachers in your building?

_____ yes _____ no

The evaluation of teachers is

_____ the sole responsibility of the principal -
_____ the joint responsibility of the principal and teachers in that teachers have some input about colleagues
_____ mainly the responsibility of the teachers
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

H. Is in-service education available to the staff in your school?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes - (more than one alternative may be checked here)
In-service education is

_____ planned by the school district
_____ planned and implemented within your school
  _____ major planning is done by the principal
  _____ major planning is shared by the principal and the teachers
_____ made available to teachers from other sources

II. Pupil Personnel

A. The major responsibility for collecting and interpreting data on student enrollment and attendance is accomplished by

_____ the central office
_____ the principal
_____ the teachers
_____ the principal and teachers
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

B. Does your school have some type of counseling or referral service?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes -

_____ the principal has the major responsibility for assessing the effectiveness of these services to pupils
_____ teachers share the responsibility in assessing the effectiveness of these services

C. Continual assessment and interpretation of pupil growth

_____ is accomplished mainly by the pupils' teachers
_____ is accomplished by teachers with the direct participation of the principal
_____ is accomplished by indirect participation of the principal through policy formulation
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

D. With respect to pupil discipline
_____ there is no established procedure
_____ teachers make final decisions
_____ a policy where the principal makes final decisions has been established
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

III. Staff Personnel

A. Does the principal have some part in the recruitment of staff personnel?
_____ yes _____ no

B. Selection of staff personnel is made
_____ by the central office
_____ by the central office in consultation with the principal
_____ by the central office with the approval of the principal
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

C. Does the principal maintain a system of staff personnel records?
_____ yes _____ no

D. Are instructional assignments made on the basis of individual interests and strengths?
_____ yes _____ no

IV. Community School Leadership

A. The principal meets with members of the community, other than parents
_____ frequently
_____ occasionally
_____ rarely
_____ never

B. Which of the following are used as a means of communication by the principal with the community on a regular basis?
_____ Principal's Newsletter
_____ PTA Meetings
_____ Parents' study groups
_____ Orientation for new parents
_____ Coverage of school events in a local newspaper
_____ Other (please specify) _____

_____

V. Organization and Structure

A. Is your school free to change the organizational pattern of the school? (e.g. team teaching, multi-age grouping, etc.)
_____ yes _____ no

B. Have there been organizational changes in your school recently? (within the last 5 years)
_____ yes _____ no

If yes, -
Have they been initiated by
_____ the central office?
_____ the principal?
_____ the principal and the staff?
_____ the staff?
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

In what areas have these changes occurred?
_____ team teaching and planning?
_____ cooperative teaching?
_____ differentiated staffing?
_____ change in the physical plant?
_____ programmed instruction?
_____ multi-age grouping?
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

VI. School Plant and School Transportation

A. In the selection of maintenance and custodial personnel, the principal
_____ has nothing to say
_____ may accept or reject personnel
_____ may make recommendations
_____ may make decisions independent of the central office
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

B. The principal evaluated the maintenance program
_____ on a regular basis
_____ occasionally
_____ rarely
_____ never

C. The maintenance of a safety program in the school (e.g. patrols) is accomplished
_____ mainly by the teachers
_____ by the teachers with the direct participation of the principal
_____ by indirect participation of the principal through policy formulation
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

D. The principal is able to modify plant facilities to meet the needs of the educational program.
_____ yes _____ no

VII. School Finance and Business Management

A. The school budget is prepared by
_____ the central office
_____ the principal
_____ the principal and the teachers
_____ the teachers under the supervision of the principal
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

B. Approval of the budget is made
_____ by the central office with little input from the principal
_____ by the central office after the principal has the opportunity to explain and defend it
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

C. Administration of the budget is accomplished
_____ by the principal mainly
_____ by the principal and the staff
_____ other (please specify) _____

_____

D. The principal accounts for school monies on a regular basis to the central office.
_____ yes _____ no

The principal accounts for school monies on a regular basis to the staff.
_____ yes _____ no

January 25, 1973

Dear Colleague,

I would like to request a few minutes of your time to furnish some information for a research project I am conducting. This project has been planned in consultation with an adviser and approved as part of a graduate program in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Minnesota.

This research is intended to study relationships between role perceptions and innovations. The lack of data on this subject should add special significance to the findings.

Since your school has been selected for participation in the study by a sampling procedure, your response is essential to the validity of the conclusions. Responses will not be identified. Coding is for the purpose of facilitating follow-up.

I would truly appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Adele Hellweg

AH/jr
Encl.

February 9, 1973

Dear Colleague,

Recently you received a questionnaire on a study I am conducting on role perceptions and innovations. I do realize how busy you must be as an elementary principal, but I would truly appreciate your taking a few minutes to complete it. Your response is necessary as part of my sample.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Adele Hellweg

Adele Hellweg

P.S. Please call 545-1683 if you have misplaced your questionnaire. Thank you